IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF
ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G. BHAVANI PRASAD

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION Nos.1322 & 1721 OF 2007
Dated : February 7, 2007

–

W.P.NO.1322 OF 2007:

Between:

1.Smt. M. Lakshmi Narayanamma,
W/o M. Seenu, Mahammadabad,
O.D.C. Mandal, Ananthapur
District. ...Petitioner

AND

The Station House Officer,
Central Crime Station,
Anantapur and another.
...Respondents

W.P.NO.1721 OF 2007:

Between:
M.Rama, W/o. Yerra Swamy,
30 years, Mamadabad Village,
Ammuduguru Post and Mandal,
Ananthapur District.
...Petitioner

AND

The Station House Officer,
City Crime Station,
Anantapur and another.
...Respondents

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.BHAVANI PRASAD

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION Nos.1322 & 1721 OF 2007

ORAL COMMON ORDER: **(per the Hon'ble Sri Justice D.S.R.Varma)**

Heard the learned Government Pleader for Home, representing the learned Advocate General, appearing for the respondents.

2. Since the sum and substance in the telegram and the petition, dated 22.01.2007 and 29.01.2007, respectively, is one and the same, both the writ petitions are disposed of by this common order.

3. W.P.No.1322 of 2007 is taken up on the basis of a telegram, dated 22.01.2007 and W.P.No.1721 of 2007 is taken up on the basis a petition, dated 29.01.207, by one M.Lakshmi Narayanamma and one M.Rama, the wife and sister of one M.Seenu, to the Hon'ble the Chief

Justice, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, alleging that the alleged detenue by name M.Seenu, was illegally detained by the Central Crime Station, Anantapur, and the petitioners are apprehending danger to his life at the hands of the police and, therefore, sought to set him at liberty forthwith.

4. In response to the notices, issued by this Court, the Circle Inspector of Police, Central Crime Station, Anantapur District, filed a counter-affidavit, stating, *inter alia*, that the alleged detenue was not required in any of the offences within their jurisdiction.

5. Added to the above, it is further stated in the counter-affidavit that the alleged detenue is freely moving in the village and, in support of this averment, the statement made by the alleged detenue, which was recorded by the Mandal Revenue Officer, Amadagur, and attested by two witnesses viz., S. Srinivasulu and Mr. Govind Reddy, is enclosed to the counter affidavit.

6. Basing on the said voluntary statement made by the alleged detenue, the Mandal Revenue Officer, Amadagur, has issued a certificate to the effect that the alleged detenue has been moving freely in the village.

7. In view of the revelations in the counter-affidavit, we do not find any truth in the allegations made by the petitioners, the writ petition fails and is liable to be dismissed.

8. Accordingly, both the writ petitions are dismissed, at the stage of admission. However, there shall be no order as to cost.

_____

D.S.R.Varma, J.

_____

G.Bhavani Prasad, J.

07TH FEBRUARY 2007

MAS/KRK